

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 4076  
**APPLICANT NAME:** County of San Bernardino  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Cucamonga Basin #6 and Spreading Grounds

**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$10,000,000  
**COST MATCH:** \$11,200,000  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$21,200,000

**DESCRIPTION:** The project will include improvements to the existing interim basin and channel in the Cucamonga Basin 6 and Spreading Grounds area, southerly of the 210 Freeway, between Campus Avenue on the west and Cucamonga Creek on the east. These improvements will provide 100-year flood protection for the downstream community by attenuating the storm flows. In addition, the improved basin will capture the flows in a more efficient manner for the groundwater recharge activities of the San Antonio Water Company and the Cucamonga Valley Water District and will allow environmental enhancements including wetlands and habitat re-establishment.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 1

The applicant is using the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority's (PIN 6986) IRWMP as its IRWMP. The applicant is not a member of SAWPA. The applicant did not adopt the IRWMP. The applicant submitted an adoption resolution, but it shows only one signature and that signature was with another agency/applicant (SAWPA PIN #6986).

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The region is the Santa Ana River Watershed, and its planning agency is SAWPA which is made up of five member agencies. Many resources and characteristics of the watershed including hydrology, geomorphology, ecology, open space and recreation, water supply, water quality, flood control, social and cultural, demographics (population projections and disadvantaged communities), and economics are discussed in IRWMP. Maps depicting various watershed characteristics are also provided. The applicant explains why region is appropriate for regional water management, describes water quantity and quality, and describes water supply and demand. Discussion of social and cultural topics could have been explicitly stated.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The applicant lists topics that will be updated to reflect: 1) update regional issues, 2) describe long-term solutions, 3) adapt to changes in member and member sub-agencies planning, 4) review 2010, 2025, and 2050 of water demands and supplies, 5) identify water resource projects, 6) integrate available resources, 7) include projects that enhance the environment, 8) assure that three years of groundwater storage is maintained in the Santa Ana River Basin by 2020, and 9) assure a salt balance. These topics were determined by a collaborative planning process that includes SAWPA, its member agencies, and other water resource agencies. Major water related issues were discussed, but no conflicts or impediments were mentioned.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The IRWMP lists six integrated elements: water storage, water quality improvements, water recycling, flood protection, wetlands/environment/habitat, and recreation/ conservation. Under each strategy, there are multiple projects to be implemented by SAWPA, its member agencies, and other local agencies. There is no discussion on why a strategy is not applicable to IRWMP or watershed. The IRWMP discusses how these elements actually are individual ones from agencies and stakeholders in the watershed and SAWPA incorporated them as regional strategies. This approach results in a broad mix of strategies to be implemented in the watershed and serves individual agencies and regional objectives. The applicant relies heavily on SAWPA's IRWMP content to satisfy these criteria and vaguely connects proposed project to IRWMP.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP listed 185 total projects from 50 entities. SAWPA selected priority projects using a seven step evaluation and the priority projects were pared down to 20 out of 185. The long- and short-term priority discussions while ambitious are also general. The applicant does not discuss how decision making would respond to future changes, or how project sequencing would be altered based on implementation responses. The applicant did not demonstrate from project sequencing why its proposal should move ahead of the IRWMP priority projects or the implementation schedule.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The IRWMP identifies actions, current projects and studies, and multiple task force activities, but does not discuss how they relate to the proposed priority projects. An overview schedule and individual timelines for each priority project are included. SAWPA will be the entity responsible for implementation. The discussion of the economic and technical feasibilities of the priority projects could have been more detailed for each project. Considering the number and size of projects, showing the sequence for the projects to understand integration between projects would have been helpful.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP discusses how priority projects would provide potential positive impacts and multiple integrated benefits in region. An elaborate matrix shows how the priority projects will implement strategies and provide benefits. However, the discussion on integrated multiple benefits and negative impacts for the region could have been more concise. Brief discussions of evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources are provided.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP briefly discussed plan performance as quantitative outcome indicators, qualitative goals, data gaps, and use of a database management system. IRWMP performance measures included CEQA review, schedule and budget tracking, site visits, documentation requirements, periodic review and evaluation, agreement deliverables, invoice procedures, audits, and project closeout procedures. However, these performance measures do not adequately address how the applicant and participating agencies will adapt to changes in project operation and implementation. Further, the IRWMP does not include a thorough discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in the development of IRWMP.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The IRWMP states SAWPA, as the administrator, will collect and provide project information/data, water quality and quantity information, maintain other programmatic information for analysis and future planning. The IRWMP lists 8 on-going monitoring programs. SAWPA will also provide status reports to communicate efforts to the SWB and public. IRWMP will support statewide data needs by integrating data with SWAMP and GAMA. The database management system called SAWDMS would standardize data, enable agencies on-line data access, serve as tool to improve water quality, and integrate surface and groundwater data to assist numerous programs. Yet, the applicant could have provided more information how they would use SAWDMS because it is a main IRWMP tool.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Total project costs and grant requests are provided. There was no discussion of financing issues other than the IRWMP stating implementation is dependent on availability of outside funding. SAWPA stated it is actively seeking funding opportunities as they become available from Propositions 13 and 50, existing seed and partnership monies, agency general funds, program funds, and service fees. Funding sources and multiple partner agencies for each priority project were identified in the cost estimates, but it was not clear which entity or entities will actually fund each project. The applicant failed to address ongoing financing and other support for the future O&M of each priority project.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The IRWMP demonstrated coordination with local planning and management efforts. The IRWMP was developed in accordance with other applicable local and State plans including conservation, facilities, coastal, subregion, endanger species, environmental assessment, nutrient removal, watershed, and other plans and programs. The applicant states that the general plans for each of the watersheds three major counties and 59 cites form the cornerstone of policy development within the watershed.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The IRWMP demonstrated stakeholder involvement and coordination efforts are directed by SAWPA and its member agencies. History of involvement and coordination with local, State, and federal level agencies were evident. Participation by grassroots organizations and DACs and environmental justice issues were addressed through the stakeholder process.

### Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

### Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

This one-project proposal will provide 100-year flood protection by constructing a detention basin and connect to lower basin via new jurisdictional dam and outlet drain into Cucamonga Creek Channel and capture storm flows to improve/support groundwater recharge activities. The applicant discusses scientific basis, metrics, water quality, and source water protection. The project demonstrates multiple integrated benefits, but linkage to the IRWMP implementation is lacking. No hydrologic/hydraulic or feasibility studies are provided to the support feasibility of project. The applicant states than an existing EIR, which includes the project, is not expected to change, but will be assessed again after the design phase.

### Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

2

There was no project prioritization discussion because the proposal consists of one project. This project is not a priority project for SAWPA's IRWMP, but it is listed in the IRWMP. There was insufficient information to understand the relationship of the proposal to IRWMP implementation. The applicant does not demonstrate why this project should move ahead of IRWMP schedule or be of higher importance than the other IRWMP priority projects.

### Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

Cost estimate shows the one project included in this proposal and appears consistent with schedule. Project administration costs, construction administration, and construction/implementation contingencies seem reasonable. Matching funds equals 52.8%. Matching fund sources come from San Bernardino County Flood Control District Zone 1 and City of Upland Colonies Mitigation Trust Account. The applicant mentions that its partner agencies (San Antonio Water Company and Cucamonga Valley Water District) are involved in the recharge part of the project, but does not explain if they are contributing financially.

### Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The schedule shows appears to be consistent with cost estimate. Project duration is over four years and construction will not begin until 2009. More details on subtasks would have been helpful. The applicant does not demonstrate how or why related elements of the IRWMP will be completed on schedule. The applicant does not refer to IRWMP schedule to show how its project fits into the larger picture.

### Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The current interim basin is insufficient, because it is not an engineered facility to adequately capture storm flows and recharge the basin. Recent problems with combating wildfires and floods, and FEMA-declared disasters have drained applicant's resources to fund many construction projects. Non-implementation of the proposed project will threaten residential areas, increase dependency on imported water, decrease groundwater table, result in critical water shortages, and limit habitat and recreational resources. Environmental impacts are not discussed. The applicant does not relate project back to IRWMP water management impacts and benefits.

### Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

4

The IRWMP states all projects support to some extent DACs. The applicant states that no DACs benefit directly from the proposed project, but that small pockets of DACs will benefit from an increased groundwater table. However, no supporting documentation is provided. Data on total population, DAC population, and MHI are provided, but no calculations were provided.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant's project does not thoroughly address Program Preferences. The project is for a flood control project and groundwater recharge as its main components. The applicant's one-project proposal does not demonstrate integrated implementation, but it demonstrates multiple benefits, such as storm water capture, property protection, improve groundwater recharge and groundwater management and provide wetland habitat. The applicant does not relate the project back to IRWMP implementation or objectives. This proposal does not meet the preference for groundwater projects, since it is located within the MWD service area.

TOTAL SCORE: 74